

LWCF Evaluation Criteria

The 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan and Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Unifying Strategy establishes priorities for funding outdoor recreation in Washington State. This evaluation instrument incorporates the plan's priorities identified specifically for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program that preserves and develops public outdoor recreation lands for the benefit of all citizens. This priority rating system is part of the LWCF open project selection or evaluation process.

Below are the changes to the evaluation instrument to reflect the 2018-2022 Unifying Strategy. These changes are incorporated into the evaluation criteria starting in the 2018 grant round.

- Add specific instructions on how to reply to criteria #2 "Need satisfaction and diversity of recreation".
 - This change identifies the types of underserved populations and health indicators where the project is located.
- Remove criteria #6 "Federal grant program goals".
 - There are no specific federal grant program goals at this time.
- Remove criteria #7 "Readiness".
 - All project must meet the same level of readiness in order to receive grant funds; therefore, this criteria does not provide an effective way to discern the merits of individual projects.

LWCF Evaluation Criteria Summary						
Scored by	#	Title	Project Type Questions	Maximum Points	Priority	Percent of Total
Advisory Committee	1	Need	All projects	15	SCORP	21% <u>26%</u>
Advisory Committee	2	Need satisfaction and diversity of recreation	All projects	10	SCORP	14% <u>17%</u>
Advisory Committee	3	Immediacy of threat and viability	Acquisition	10	Board	17% <u>14%</u>
			Combination	5		7% <u>9%</u>
Advisory Committee	4	Project design	Development	10	SCORP	14% <u>17%</u>
			Combination	5		7% <u>9%</u>
Advisory Committee	5	Sustainability and environmental stewardship	All projects	10	SCORP	14% <u>17%</u>
Advisory Committee	6	Federal grant program goals	All projects	10	National Park Service	14%
Advisory Committee	7	Readiness	All projects	5	Board	7%
Advisory Committee	8 <u>6</u>	Community support	All projects	5	Board	7% <u>9%</u>
Advisory Committee	9 <u>7</u>	Cost efficiencies	All projects	5	Board	7% <u>9%</u>
RCO Staff	10 <u>8</u>	Population proximity	All projects	3	State law	4% <u>5%</u>
RCO Staff	11 <u>9</u>	Applicant compliance	All projects	0	National Park Service	0%
Total Points Possible				73 <u>58</u>		

The detailed scoring criteria are on the following pages.

Detailed Scoring Criteria

Scored by the Advisory Committee

1. **Need.** Considering the availability of existing outdoor recreation facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities?

Describe your service area, the need for the project and how it relates to the service area, with quantifiable data that supports the following:

- Inventory of existing sites and facilities within the service area
- Amount of use of existing sites and their condition
- Populations or user groups in your service area that have unmet needs
- Changing demographics
- Whether the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan such as a community's comprehensive plan (level of service), a state agency capital improvement plan, or a park or open space plan

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points, which are multiplied later by 3.

2. **Need Satisfaction and Diversity of Recreation.** To what extent does this project fill the need described in Question 1, provide or contribute to the diversity of outdoor recreation assets within the service area, and address the priorities for underserved populations and health recommendations in the 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan?

Consider the following:

- What will this site provide, in terms of areas, or facilities that are missing from your inventory of assets?
- How will this site serve populations that are not served or are underserved?
- How does this site support activities that are not served or are underserved?
- How does this project help you provide a range of recreational opportunities for a variety of recreational interests?
- How does this project meet the need?

To assist you in answering the questions about underserved populations and health recommendations, locate your project on the Grant Applicant Data Tool to determine

whether your project is in a census tract in which one or more of the populations listed below are present. You also may provide more specific data about the demographics and health conditions of the population within the service area of the proposed project.

Demographic Measures for Underserved Populations

- The median household income level in the census tract where the project is located is below the median statewide household income level (\$62,108 as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people of color in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (30 percent as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people with a disability in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (13 percent as of 2015)

Opportunities for Health Improvements

- The body mass index for ages 16-19 in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the state body mass index (22.94 as of 2015)
- The mortality rate in the census tract where the project is located higher than the statewide mortality rate (692 as of 2015)

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

3. Immediacy of Threat and Viability (acquisition and combination projects only).

Why purchase this particular property at this time? How viable are the anticipated future uses and benefits of the site?

Consider the following:

Threat

- What is the immediate threat or will the property be available for acquisition at a later time?
- What is the significance of the threat? Is it imminent?
- Why was this property selected over other properties considered?
- Is this a high priority outdoor recreation property that will be lost if funding is not made available?
- What proactive steps have you taken to preserve the opportunity for securing this property until funds become available? Why?

Viability

- How does existing or planned land use in the surrounding area affect the viability of the site and the proposed outdoor recreation use?
- How many acres will be added to the outdoor recreation inventory? Is this a new site or expansion of an existing area?
- How suitable is the site for the intended use? Describe the attributes: size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, location, utility service, wetlands, legal access, etc.
- Will the site be available immediately for public use or will the site require some improvement to make it available for public use? If improvements are necessary, what is the timeframe for implementing future site improvements?
- Who will maintain the site and what resources are necessary and available for maintenance of the site?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2 for acquisition projects.

4. Project Design (development and combination projects only). Is the project well designed?

Consider the following:

- Does this property support the type of development proposed? Describe the attributes: size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, location and access, utility service, wetlands, etc.
- How does the project design make the best use of the site?
- How well does the design provide equal access for all people, including those with disabilities? How does this project exceed current barrier-free requirements?
- Does the nature and condition of existing or planned land use in the surrounding area support the type of development proposed?
- How does the design conform to current permitting requirements, building codes, safety standards, best management practices, etc.? What, if any, are the mitigation requirements for this project?
- Does the design align with the described need?
- Are the access routes (paths, walkways, sidewalks) designed appropriately (width, surfacing) for the use and do they provide connectivity to all site elements?

- For trails, does the design provide adequate separation from roadways, surfacing, width, spatial relationships, grades, curves, switchbacks, road crossings, and trailhead locations?
- Is the cost estimate realistic?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points, which are multiplied later by 2 for development projects.

5. Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship. Will the project result in a quality, sustainable, recreational opportunity while protecting the integrity of the environment?

Factors to consider for acquisition and/or development projects are outlined in this table.

Acquisition	Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the acquisition and proposed development preserve the natural function of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed development protect natural resources onsite and integrate sustainable elements such as low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do the proposed uses protect, enhance or restore the ecosystem functions of the property? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there invasive species on site? If there are, what is your response plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation/Surfaces – Are you replacing invasive plant species with native vegetation? Are you using pervious surfaces for any of the proposed facilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the strategy or plan for maintenance and stewardship of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education – Are you installing interpretive panels/signs that educate users about sustainability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do the natural characteristics of the site support future planned uses? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials – What sustainable materials are included in the project?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide for greater fuel economy, is the proposed acquisition located close to the intended users? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy – What energy efficient features are you adding?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What modes of transportation provide access to the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What modes of transportation provide access to the site?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this project protect wetlands or wetland functions? Describe the size, quality and classification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water – Is the on-site storm water managed by rain gardens, porous paving, or other sustainable features? Does the design exceed permit requirements for storm water management?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the proposed acquisition help create connectivity? How many acres are already protected? How critical is this property to the overall plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are wetlands on site, describe the size, quality and classification and explain how the design considers the wetland functions.

Acquisition	Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other noteworthy characteristics demonstrate how the natural features of the site contribute to energy efficiency, less maintenance, fewer environmental impacts, or sustainability? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the strategy or plan for maintenance and stewardship of the site?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other developed features will contribute to increasing energy efficiencies, reducing maintenance, minimizing environmental impacts, or being more sustainable?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

6. Federal grant program goals. How well does the proposed project meet Department of the Interior and National Park Service goals for grant programs?

The National Park Service is a bureau within the Department of Interior. Both the National Park Service and the Department of Interior develop annual goals for their programs. Applicants and evaluators will be provided with the most recent set of federal goals. Evaluators will be asked to determine the extent to which a proposed project addresses those goals.

For example: if the National Park Service has goals to encourage projects that meet the needs of underserved communities, expand the public recreation estate, or strengthen the health and vitality of the American people, applicants should demonstrate how their projects address these goals locally, regionally, or statewide.

Projects providing opportunities that help meet one or more federal goals should receive higher scores than those projects that do not help meet any of the goals.

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points, which are multiplied later by 2.

7. Readiness. Is the proposed project ready to proceed?

National Park Service rules and board policy give preference to proposals where the applicant is ready to start work as soon as a project agreement is signed.

Consider the following:

- Is there a project implementation plan in place?
- What is the proposed timeline for acquisition and/or development?
- Is there known opposition that might delay implementation of the project?

Development projects

- ~~Is the design in the conceptual phase or has a master plan been developed?~~
- ~~Has the master plan been adopted by the governing body?~~
- ~~What percentage of the design is completed to date?~~
- ~~What permits are in hand for this project? What permits or clearances are still needed?~~
- ~~Are the bid documents ready?~~

Acquisition projects

- ~~Was the property purchased under a waiver of retroactivity?~~
- ~~Is there an option or a first right of refusal to purchase the property?~~
- ~~Are required appraisals and reviews completed?~~
- ~~Is there a willing seller?~~
- ~~How far along are you in securing the property?~~

▲ ~~Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points.~~

8.6. Community support. To what extent has the community been provided with an adequate opportunity to become informed about the project and provide input? What is the level of community support for the project?

Examples of community involvement may include public meetings, articles in local papers, newsletters, media coverage, and involvement in a local planning process that includes the specific project.

Examples of community support may include voter approved initiatives, bond issues, or referenda; endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user or "friends" groups; letters of support or petitions; or editorials.

▲ Evaluators score 0-5 points for all projects.

9.7. Cost efficiencies. To what extent does this project demonstrate efficiencies or a reduction in government costs through documented use of donations or other resources?

Donations – cash, real property, volunteer labor, equipment use, or materials

- What are the donations for this project?
- Who is making the donations?
- What are the values of the donations and how were the values determined?
- Are the donations in hand?
- If the donations are not in hand, do you have letters of commitment from the donors that specify what is being donated and when?
- Are the donations necessary for implementation of the project? Are donations included in the project proposal?

Private grants awarded by non-governmental organizations

- Is there a private grant that is being used as match for this project?
- Who awarded the grant?
- What is the grant amount?
- What is the purpose of the grant?
- When will grant funds be available?

Are there other efficiencies for this project that will result in cost savings?

- What is the cost efficiency?
- Who is providing it?
- What's the value?
- When was the commitment made and when does it expire?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points.

Revised February 2016

Scored by RCO Staff – Applicants Do Not Answer

~~10.8.~~ Population Proximity. Is the project in a populated area?

This question is scored based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

- ▲ Point Range: RCO staff awards a maximum of 3 points. The result from "A" is added to the result from "B." Projects in cities with more than 5,000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "A" and "B."

A. The project is in the urban growth area boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

AND

A. The project is in a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

11.9. Applicant compliance. Is the sponsor in compliance with its RCO grant agreements?

When scoring this question, staff will consider the applicant's record in all RCO-managed grant programs.

- ▲ Point Range: -2 to 0

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0 points | Sponsor has no known compliance issues and no unapproved conversions. |
| -1 point | Sponsor has one or more known compliance issues <i>including at least one unapproved conversion</i> , but actively is working to correct the issues. |
| -2 points | Sponsor has one or more known compliance issues <i>including at least one unapproved conversion</i> , but is not working actively to correct the issues; or the sponsor has been identified as a high-risk sponsor. |